## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MICHAEL LAWRENCE LOMBARDO,

Case No. 2:24-cv-01711-KBH

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER BRYAN LEONARD and IMS TECHNOLOGY SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

PLAINTFF'S RESPONSE TO MOTION OF IMS TECHNOLOGY

The Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, responds to the referenced motion as follows:

SERVICES INC. TO DISMSS PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 12(B)(6)

1. In its motion, Defendant IMS Technology Services Inc. ("IMS Technology") argues that, because Pennsylvania law does not recognize a claim of respondent superior as a stand-alone claim and because I pled that claim against IMS Technology as such, my complaint as against it must be dismissed.

- 2. Because I am within the time to amend my complaint as of right, Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B), I have, simultaneously with the filing of this response, filed an amended complaint in which I have, among things, corrected the pleading deficiency upon which IMS Technology bases its motion to dismiss. I have a attached a copy of my amended complaint for the Court's convenience as Exhibit A. Alternatively, if I cannot amend my complaint as of right, I ask that the Court grant me permission to file the amended complaint attached hereto.
- 3. Because my amended complaint moots the basis upon which IMS Technology seeks dismissal, its motion must be denied.

WHEREFORE, I respectfully request that IMS Technology's motion be denied.

Dated: June 8, 2024 Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lombardo, Pro Se

45 Laurel Trail Monroe NY 10950

Telephone: (315) 225-5429

Email: iamthemichaellawrence@gmail.com